

REMARKSClaim Summary

Claims 1, 8, and 24 are amended to recite “antenna parameter information.” Claim 1 is further amended to recite “the antenna parameter information within the antenna being accessed by the portable communication device,” and claim 8 is further amended to recite “the antenna parameter information being accessed through the single coaxial antenna connector.” These changes are based at least on FIG. 2 and the accompanying description on page 5, lines 11-20, and page 6, lines 3 and 4 of the specification as filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

Claim 12 is amended to recite a single wire memory device “programmed with antenna parameter information being” electrically coupled to the antenna center conductor. These changes are based at least on FIG. 2 and the accompanying description on page 5, lines 11-29 of the specification as filed.

Claim 22 is amended to recite a memory embedded within the antenna “programmed with antenna parameter information.” These changes are based at least on FIG. 2 and the accompanying description on page 5, lines 11-29 of the specification as filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

Claim 26 is amended to be consistent with claim 24 as amended.

Claims 1-26 remain in the application.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Rejection of claims 1-10, 12-15, and 18-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by US 6486832 (Abramov)

Applicant respectfully traverses in part and amends in part. Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-10, 12-15, and 18-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Abramov as herein amended.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the present application and the cited art and has amended independent claim 1 to clarify the claimed invention. In particular, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that “at least one single wire memory device programmed with antenna parameter information, the antenna parameter information within the antenna being accessed by the portable communication device.” Claim 8 has been amended similar to claim 1 to recite “single wire memory device programmed with antenna parameter information,” and further amended to recite “the antenna parameter information being accessed through the single coaxial connector.” Claim 12 has been amended to recite “a single wire memory device programmed with antenna parameter information.” Claim 22 has been amended to recite “a memory embedded within the antenna programmed with antenna parameter information.” Claim 24 has been amended to recite “a memory device storing antenna parameter information.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Abramov does not anticipate, either expressly or inherently, each and every element as set forth in independent claims 1, 8, 12, 22, and 24.

Abramov describes an antenna housing that contains a spinning antenna, a motor driver, and a motor. The antenna housing is connected to a controller, which further contains a transceiver, an antenna control unit, and a computer. The antenna control unit has a Random Access Memory (RAM) that stores application software. The application software is used by a Digital Signal Processor (DSP) to control the motor in the antenna housing. In addition, the transceiver receives and sends RF signals to the antenna and the antenna control unit sends the direction-selection signals to the antenna. See col. 2, lines 54-65, and col. 3, line 41 to col. 4, line 27 of Abramov.

As far as the embodiment of Abramov's FIG. 3 and FIG. 4, component "33" (flash/RAM) is contained in "30" (antenna control unit) which is contained within "20" (controller). Controller "20" is outside of the antenna in both FIGs 3 and 4. Even if we consider the embodiment of FIG. 6, described only in col. 5, lines 18-35, which moves control unit "30" (having memory "33") out of "20" (controller) and into the antenna, nowhere is there a teaching of accessing this memory by a communication device, as claimed in Applicant's claim 1.

Applicant's amended claim 1 recites a "single wire memory device" that is "programmed with antenna parameter information." In contrast, Abramov makes no mention of a single wire memory device programmed with antenna parameter information. At most, Abramov simply discloses an antenna unit that has flash memory that stores application software (executable code) for the DSP to generate a "direction/selection signal". See col. 4, lines 21-23 of Abramov. Abramov's "direction/selection signal" is not equivalent to Applicant's antenna parameter information. Thus, Applicant's claimed limitation is not found in Abramov.

In addition, amended claim 1 recites that "the antenna parameter information within the antenna" is "being accessed by the portable communication device." In contrast, Abramov describes that the stored application software is being used by the DSP that is located in an antenna control unit. See col. 4, lines 21-27 of Abramov. Thus, Abramov is missing a further limitation claimed by Applicant.

Applicant's amended claim 8 recites a "single wire memory device programmed with antenna parameter information," which as discussed above is not found in Abramov. In addition, amended claim 8 recites that "the antenna parameter information" is "being accessed through the single coaxial connector." As mentioned above, since Abramov fails to disclose "the antenna parameter information," "the antenna parameter information being accessed through the single coaxial connector" is also not found in Abramov. At most, Abramov discloses data being sent to peripherals through a universal serial bus (USB). See col. 2, lines 61-67 of Abramov. Applicant asserts that a single coaxial connector and universal serial bus are two entirely different interface mechanisms and one cannot be substituted for the other. USB requires four wires, and thus can not be equated to a single coaxial connector.

Applicant's amended claim 12 recites "a single wire memory device programmed with antenna parameter information," which as discussed above is not found in Abramov. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendment to claim 12 overcomes the rejection.

Applicant's amended claim 22 recites "a memory embedded within the antenna programmed with antenna parameter information," which as discussed above is not found in Abramov. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendment to claim 22 overcomes the rejection.

Applicant's amended claim 24 recites "a memory device storing antenna parameter information," which as discussed above is not found in Abramov. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendment to claim 24 overcomes the rejection.

With regard to claim 9, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the statement in item 2, page 4, of the Office Action dated June 15, 2007 that "[r]egarding claim 9, Abramov et al discloses a radio and antenna interface (figs. 1 and 6) system, comprising: a radio including radio electronic circuitry (figs. 3-5) for diplexing RF and baseband signals... an antenna (12 of figs. 1, 12 of figs. 3-4) including antenna electronic circuitry for diplexing RF and baseband signals... a memory device embedded in the antenna and coupled to the coaxial interface (col. 2, lines 55-65; col. 3, lines 18-41; col. 3, line 53-col. 4, line 27; col. 4, lines 42-67)."

Applicant's claim 9 recites "radio electronic circuitry for diplexing RF and baseband signals." Abramov makes no mention of radio electronic circuitry that is used for diplexing RF and baseband signals. At most, Abramov simply discloses a circuit in a transceiver that receives and transmits RF signal. See col. 3, lines 42-53 of Abramov. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide exact citation (line numbers) showing such a limitation or withdraw the rejection.

Further, Abramov makes no mention of antenna electronic circuitry that is used for diplexing RF and baseband signals. At most, Abramov simply discloses an antenna connected to a motor. See col. 2, lines 56-60. In contrast, Applicant's claim 9 recites "antenna electronic

circuitry for diplexing RF and baseband signals.” Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide exact citation (line numbers) showing such a limitation or withdraw the rejection.

In addition, Applicant’s claim 9 recites “a memory device embedded in the antenna and coupled to the coaxial interface.” In contrast, Abramov discloses a flash memory that is connected to a DSP in an antenna control unit. See col. 4, lines 19-23 of Abramov. Thus, Abramov makes no mention of a memory device that is embedded in the antenna and coupled to the coaxial interface as required by independent claim 9.

Regarding claim 15, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the statement in item 2, page 5, of the Office Action that “[r]egarding claim 15 and 18, Abramov et al discloses an antenna interface (figs. 1 and 6) comprising: an antenna center conductor (12 of figs. 1, 12 of figs. 3-4)...” Abramov makes no mention of an antenna center conductor within an antenna. At most, Abramov simply discloses an antenna connected to a motor. See col. 2, lines 56-60. In contrast, Applicant’s claim recites “an antenna center conductor within an antenna.” Thus, Applicant’s such a limitation is not found in Abramov.

In addition, Office Action provides no citation to Applicant’s claim 15 limitation “a single wire memory device within the antenna, the single wire memory device electrically coupled to the antenna center conductor.” Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to provide exact citation (line numbers) showing such a limitation or withdraw the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Abramov does not disclose Applicant’s above mentioned limitations. Applicant therefore submits that independent claims 1, 8, 9, 12, 15, 22, and 24 are not anticipated by Abramov and therefore the rejection of claims 1, 8, 9, 12, 15, 22, and 24 under 35 USC 102(e) is improper and should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests that claims 1, 8, 9, 12, 15, 22, and 24 may now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 2-7 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1, dependent claims 10 and 11 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim

9, dependent claims 13 and 14 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 12, dependent claims 16-21 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 15, dependent claim 23 depends from, and includes all the limitations of independent claim 22, dependent claims 25 and 26 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 24, which is shown to be allowable for the reasons given above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16-21, 23, 25, and 26 are in proper condition for allowance and requests that claims 2-7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16-21, 23, 25, and 26 may now be passed to allowance.

Acknowledgement of Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 11, 16, and 17 once amended to be rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant defers amending the claims to give the Examiner the opportunity to consider Applicant's remarks enclosed herein.

Conclusion

Applicant has reviewed the other references of record and believes that Applicant's claimed invention is patentably distinct and nonobvious over each reference taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

July 24, 2007

Motorola, Inc.
8000 West Sunrise Boulevard
Law Department – MD1610
Plantation, Florida 33322
Customer Number: 24273

By: /Barbara R. Doutre/
Barbara R. Doutre
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 39,505
Tel: 954-723-6449
Fax.: 954-723-3871
E-Mail: docketing.florida@motorola.com